UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/810,018 | 03/26/2004 | Carlos Mario Candeloro | | 7742 |
| Carlos M. Cand | 7590 04/30/200 leloro | EXAMINER | | |
| 1601 N. Sepulveda Blvd. 239 | | | CHAMPAGNE, LUNA | |
| Manhattan Beach, CA 90266 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 3627 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 04/30/2008 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| | 10/810,018 | CANDELORO, CARLOS MARIO | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | |
| | LUNA CHAMPAGNE | 3627 | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply | appears on the cover sheet with | the correspondence address | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion is a period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the material patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rep iod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH tute, cause the application to become ABAI | ATION. y be timely filed IS from the mailing date of this communication. IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | |
| Status | | | | |
| Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ To 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under the second se | his action is non-final. wance except for formal matter | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | |
| 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdright 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examination | drawn from consideration. | | | |
| 10) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Example 10. ☐ The drawing(s) filed on 26 March 2004 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11. ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the | e: a) accepted or b) object the drawing(s) be held in abeyance rection is required if the drawing(s | e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date | Paper No(s)/ | nmary (PTO-413) Mail Date rmal Patent Application | | |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Jensen (2002/0107697 A1).

Re claim 1, Jensen teaches post comprising information identifying an intended recipient functionally linked to a formatted proposal (see e.g. paragraph 0085).

Re claim 2, Jensen teaches a post wherein the formatted proposal comprises an offer to transfer units of value from a first entity to a second entity pursuant to said formatted proposal (see e.g. paragraph 0054, lines 13-21).

Re claims 3, 4, 5, Jensen teaches a post wherein the formatted proposal comprises an offer to transfer units of value from a first entity to a second entity upon receipt of said post; the formatted proposal comprises an offer to transfer units of value from a first entity to a second entity upon access to the post by the recipient; the formatted proposal comprises an offer to transfer units of value from a first entity to a second entity upon deletion of the post by the recipient (see e.g. paragraph 0109).

Application/Control Number: 10/810,018 Page 3

Art Unit: 3627

Re claim 6, Jensen teaches a method for monetizing transfer of information, said

method comprising: storing a first value comprising an identifier for a first entity (see e.g.

paragraph 0098); storing a second value comprising an entity specific unit based

amount, wherein said second value is linked to said first value (see e.g. paragraph

0082, lines 3-9); receiving information from a second entity, wherein the information

comprises an addressee comprising said first value (see e.g. paragraph 0107, line 1;

paragraph 0108, lines 1-3); transferring a unit based amount comprising said second

value from the second entity to the first entity (see e.g. paragraph 0048, lines 9-12;

paragraph 0180- lines 17-19); posting the received information to said first entity (see

e.g. paragraph 0100- lines 6-10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Jensen (2002/0107697 A1) as applied to claim 6 above, and further in view of Bednar et

al. (5,832,460).

Re claims 7, 8, 9, Jensen does explicitly teach a method wherein the information further comprises a second entity specific unit based amount specified by the second entity, said method further comprising: transferring a unit based amount comprising said second entity specific unit based amount from the first entity to the second entity upon an action comprising access to said information by said first entity, reply to such information by said first entity.

However Bednar et al. teach a method wherein the information further comprises a second entity specific unit based amount specified by the second entity (see e.g. col. 2, lines 54-56), said method further comprising: transferring a unit based amount comprising said second entity specific unit based amount from the first entity to the second entity upon an action comprising access to said information by said first entity, reply to such information by said first entity (see e.g. col. 2, lines 57-63, col. 4, lines 10-18).

Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to modify Jensen and include the steps cited above, in order to increase flexibility and allow payment to be processed on a non-exception basis.

It is considered a design choice to transfer unit based amount upon deletion of information. For example, in paragraph 0109, Jensen shows different ways of determining when to transfer unit the based amount.

Re claim 10, Jensen teaches a system comprising a processor functionally linked to a storage element and a network, wherein the storage element comprises a

database, the database further comprising a) a record comprising a first value comprising an identifier for a first entity (see e.g. paragraph 0098), b) a second value comprising an entity specific unit based amount, wherein said second value is linked to said first value (see e.g. paragraph 0082, lines 3-9),

However, Jensen does not explicitly teach a transaction table, a post table, wherein upon receipt by the processor via a network of a post from a second entity addressed to the first entity, the processor performs a method comprising storing the post in the post table and recording a transaction in the transaction table, wherein the transaction recorded comprises a third value comprising the first entity, a fourth value comprising the second entity, and a fifth value comprising a link to the stored post

However, Bednar et al. teach a transaction table (*bill database 304 - col. 3, lines 11-12*), and a post table (*template database 306 - col. 4, lines 32-34*), wherein upon receipt by the processor via a network of a post from a second entity addressed to the first entity, the processor performs a method comprising storing the post in the post table and recording a transaction in the transaction table, wherein the transaction recorded comprises a third value comprising the first entity (*customer's account number*), a fourth value comprising the second entity (*bill originator's account receivable data*) (see e.g. col. 4, lines 24-34), and a fifth value comprising a link to the stored post (see e.g. fig. 5/col. 2, lines18-19).

Therefore, it would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to modify Jensen and include the steps cited above, in order to automate the system and decrease potential cost and delay.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Kunigami (5,508,817), Biliris et al. (6,0472,72), Enyart (2006/0041505 A1), Hansen et al. (2003/0130940 A1), "Selling interrupt rights: A way to control unwanted e-mail and telephone calls" by IBM Systems Journal, Vol. 41, No 4, 2002.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LUNA CHAMPAGNE whose telephone number is (571)272-7177. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 8:30 - 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Florian Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number: 10/810,018 Page 7

Art Unit: 3627

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3627 Examiner, Art Unit 3627

April 19, 2008